

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed July 16, 2007 and the Examiner Interview of July 30, 2007. Applicant acknowledges with thanks Examiner Lewis's assistance in granting an interview on July 30, 2007, during the course of the interview the Examiner suggested that the applicant consider introducing features from dependent claims 12, 23, and 29 into independent Claim 1 to create a concrete and useful result.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

The Office Action objected to Claims 1 and 9-37 because Claim 1 allegedly did not produce a concrete and useful result. The Examiner suggested that the applicant consider introducing features from dependent claims 12, 23, and 29 into independent Claim 1 to create a concrete and useful result.

II. Applicant's Response

This response implements the Examiner's suggestion to introduce features from the dependent claims into the independent claim to create a concrete and useful result. The present Reply cancels claims 12 and 29, amends claim 1, 9, 19, and 30, and adds new claims 38-46, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1, 9-11, 13-28, and 30-46. Reconsideration of the objections is requested.

Claim 9 was amended to incorporate features from Claim 12, and made into an independent claim with features from Claim 1. Claim 19 was amended and made into an independent claim with features from Claim 1. Independent Claim 1 was amended to incorporate features from Claim 29.

Applicant respectfully submits that Independent Claims 1, 9, and 19 each satisfy the 35 U.S.C. § 101 requirement for producing a useful, concrete, and tangible result. See M.P.E.P. § 2106.

New independent claim 38 includes the features of claim 1 and additional features. New independent claim 45 includes the features of claim 9 and additional features. New independent claim 46 includes the features of claim 19 and additional features. Applicant respectfully submits that Independent Claims 38, 45, and 46 each satisfy the 35 U.S.C. § 101 requirement for producing a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

III. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 18, 2007

By: /Thomas K. Plunkett/
Thomas K. Plunkett
Reg. No. 57,253

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800